

COMMENTS ON THE EFFECT ON SHARK NOMENCLATURE IF CERTAIN  
PRINTED PLATES BY HEMPRICH AND EHRENBERG ARE ACCEPTED AS  
BEING PUBLISHED IN 1828. Z.N.(S.) 1807  
(see volume 24, pages 291–293, volume 25, pages 195–196)

By J. A. F. Garrick (*Department of Zoology, Victoria University of Wellington,  
Wellington, New Zealand*)

Roellig (1969 *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 25 : 194–195) has proposed that the presence in the library of the American Museum of Natural History of a folio of 10 plates, dated 1828, comprising the *Descriptiones Piscium* of Hemprich and Ehrenberg, constitutes evidence of publication in 1828 of that material. Virtually all other ichthyologists have regarded the 1899 version of *Symbolae Physicae* (see Roellig, p. 195) as the first publication of *Descriptiones Piscium*. Roellig's proposal considers the effect of the 1828 date only in regard to the generic name *Heterotis*. Roellig did not comment on how other names might be affected. The table below lists the names of shark species in *Descriptiones Piscium* together with what I believe to be their current equivalents.

<i>Names in</i> DESCRIPTIONES PISCIIUM	<i>Current Names</i>
plate 4, fig. 1 <i>Carcharias albomarginatus</i>	? <i>Loxodon macrorhinus</i> Müller and Henle, 1841.
plate 4, fig. 2 <i>Carcharias elegans</i>	<i>Carcharhinus melanopterus</i> (Quoy and Gaimard, 1824).
plate 4, fig. 3 <i>Carcharias taeniatus</i>	<i>Carcharhinus sorrah</i> (Valenciennes, 1841).
plate 5, fig. 1 <i>Carcharias Aaronis</i>	<i>Rhizoprionodon acutus</i> (Rüppell, 1835).
plate 5, fig. 2 <i>Carcharias Forskallii</i>	<i>Negaprion acutidens</i> (Rüppell, 1835).
plate 5, fig. 3 <i>Carcharias Hemprichii</i>	<i>Galeocerdo cuvieri</i> (Peron and Lesueur, 1822).
plate 6, fig. 1 <i>Lamna ecarinata</i>	<i>Odontaspis taurus</i> (Rafinesque, 1810).
plate 6, fig. 2 <i>Zygaena erythraea</i>	<i>Sphyrna lewini</i> (Griffith and Smith, 1834).
plate 6, fig. 3 <i>Scymnus porosus</i>	<i>Ginglymostoma ferrugineum</i> (Lesson, 1830).
plate 7, fig. 1 <i>Gymnorhinus Pharaonis</i>	<i>Carcharhinus falciformis</i> (Bibron, 1841).
plate 7, fig. 2 <i>Gymnorhinus abbreviatus</i>	<i>Carcharhinus limbatus</i> (Valenciennes, 1841).
plate 7, fig. 3 <i>Mustelus mosis</i>	<i>Mustelus</i> sp.

If my identifications are correct, at least 8 of the 12 current names could be jeopardised by Hemprich and Ehrenberg names should 1828 be accepted as the date of publication of *Descriptiones Piscium*. This, of course, is the situation in respect to the shark names only—I cannot comment on the nomenclatural sequelae for the other 14 fish species dealt with in *Descriptiones Piscium*.

Leaving aside the question of the validity of Roellig's proposal for accepting the 1828 date (which must be suspect since only one copy with that date is known) and the possible implications of this in regard to the name *Heterotis*, one is left with the conclusion that nomenclature would be much better served—in terms of stability—by retaining the *status quo* of the date of 1899 for *Descriptiones Piscium*. To proceed otherwise, by pressing for the date 1828, means giving a highly disproportionate weighting to the desirability of achieving priority in the case of only one name while neglecting the possible consequences of such action on many other well-accepted names.

In the interest of stability in nomenclature I recommend that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature place the 1828 folio of *Descriptiones Piscium* and the accompanying 1828 folio of *Descriptiones Zootomicorum* as described by Roellig (1969, p. 105) on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Works in Zoology.